

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 JUNE 2018**

Held at: The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:00am.

Present: Alun Alesbury (Deputy Chair), Heather Baker, David Coldwell, Neville Harrison (Chair), Barbara Holyome, Roger Huxstep, Doug Jones, Tom Jones, Robert Mocatta, Ian Phillips  
Ex Officio Members for Planning Policy items only (may participate on Policy Items but not vote, no participation on Development Management Items):

Margaret Paren

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Katie Kam (Senior Solicitor), Gill Welsman (Committee Officer), Richard Sandiford (Senior Committee Officer)

Also attended by: Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), David Cranmer (Development Management Lead), Victoria Corrigan (Senior Planner Development Management), Stella New (Senior Planner Development Management), Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Jack Trevelyan (Enforcement Officer), Kirsten Williamson (Planning Policy Lead)

### **OPENING REMARKS**

The Chair informed those present that:

- SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered the National Park Purposes and Duty. Members regarded themselves first and foremost as Members of the Authority, and would act in the best interests of the Authority and of the Park, rather than as representatives of their appointing authority or any interest groups.
- The meeting was being webcast by the Authority and would be available for subsequent on-line viewing. Anyone entering the meeting was considered to have given consent to be filmed or recorded, and for the possible use of images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

### **ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1170. Apologies for absence were received from Gary Marsh and Norman Dingemans.

### **ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

1171. The Chair declared a public service interest on behalf of all Members of the Committee for Agenda Items 15 and 16 as both applicants were known to Committee Members. The applicant for Agenda Item 15, Graham Morrison, was a member of the South Downs National Park Authority Design Review Panel. Sebastian Anstruther owner of the Barlavington Estate, who was the applicant for Agenda Item 16, was a Member of the South Downs National Park Authority.
1172. Neville Harrison declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 as a member of the South Downs Society who had commented on these items.
1173. Tom Jones declared a public service interest in Agenda Items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 as he was a member of Lewes District Council.
1174. Robert Mocatta declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 13 as a member of the East Hampshire District Council.
1175. Roger Huxstep declared a public service interest in Agenda Item 7 as a Councillor on Winchester District Council.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 10 MAY 2018**

1176. The minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING**

1177. There were none.

### **ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

1178. There were none.



## **ITEM 6: URGENT MATTERS**

1179. There were none.

## **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

### **ITEM 7: SDNP/18/01309/FUL LAND ADJOINING JUNCTION A31 AND A272, MATTERLEY ESTATE, PETERSFIELD ROAD, OVINGTON, HAMPSHIRE**

1180. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.

1181. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- David Pain spoke against the application on behalf of Cheriton Parish Council.
- Cassandra Frey-Mills spoke in support of the application on behalf of Boomtown Festival.
- Peveril Bruce spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

1182. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC33/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:

- Whether there had been a lack of opportunity for discussion with the agents of the application, as indicated by one of the speakers, with regard to the documentation not being made publically available.
- If any detailed landscape plans had been submitted as part of the application.
- Whether the track that continued along the edge of the field was a permitted development given the agricultural use of the land.
- Whether the land would be reinstated to its original state if the Committee followed the Officer's recommendation.
- If the owners would be able to reinstate the coach pad given the previous temporary permission.

1183. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- There had been an unfortunate issue with uploading some documentation on the website. Officers had ensure that the applicant's agent had been kept informed as soon as the direction of the application and recommendation had been known.
- A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) had been submitted. This was a layout plan with details regarding hedging and surfacing. Landscape Officers were concerned that mitigation would be inadequate with regard to the impact.
- Estate owners, as stewards of agricultural land, had permitted development rights with regard to access rights through the land for agricultural use. It was for Members to consider the use of the track with regard to this application.
- Discussions would take place with the applicant in regard to the appropriate expedient action for the pad following the Committee's recommendation.
- There was no permission in place for the coach pad.

1184. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- That this application was in an open, prominent area of downland within the National Park.
- The impact of this development would result in permanent disfigurement of the landscape and was unacceptable.
- Mitigation through planting of hedging was not appropriate, high hedges were uncharacteristic of the area.
- Concern that this development encouraged urban creep, as highlighted by the Landscape Officers, into the landscape and should not be allowed.
- Temporary permission was in place for the festival, a permanent application at this stage was premature.
- Concern that the area extending up Telegraph Hill was larger than suggested by the red line on the presentation.



- The application encouraged use of public/mass transport.
- There was a lack of sensitivity with regard to the site and its location in the National Park.
- There was opportunity to be creative and find an innovative solution to parking for this and the adjoining site.
- The proximity to the National Park boundary and the local urban area made this an important site to protect.
- The photographic evidence demonstrated that there was significant visual impact to the site.

1185. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.

1186. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report and the 14 June 2018 update sheet.

#### **ITEM 8: SDNP/18/00138/FUL - RETENTION OF CRUCIFIX - THE TOTE HOUSE, THE MOTOR ROAD, OLD RACECOURSE, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 1UR**

1187. The Case Officer presented an overview of agenda items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. He verbally updated the meeting with regard to late representations that had been made for Agenda Items 11 and 12 by the British Racehorse Association in relation to the impact on the operation on training of racehorses and the heritage of the historic nature of the racecourse. Further comments had been received from the Vice-Chairman of St Ann (without) Parish for Agenda Items 11 and 12 in regard to the use of the land.

1188. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.

1189. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Vic lent spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Kingston Ward of Lewes District Council.

1190. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC34/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:

- Whether there was any marking or plaque on the cross to indicate that it commemorated a particular event.
- Given that permissive development rights had been removed whether the cross was considered to be a development.

1191. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- There was no marking on the cross relating to a particular event. The cross had differing significance for different individuals.
- The cross constituted an engineering operation and required permission.

1192. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- The cross was located in a beautiful location within the National Park.
- Concern that this cross created unnecessary 'clutter', which when viewed in one direction could be considered to be located in a downland open space. In reality the site was in close proximity to nearby developments.
- Recognition that whilst there was no specific religious significance for the cross in this location, there was significance to individuals. Religious connotations shouldn't be the rationale for the continued existence of the cross in this location.
- There should be an indication on the cross of any commemoration for it to reflect the purpose of installation.
- The cross should not be removed due to religious connotations, but due to the location within the National Park and the precedent set for adding 'clutter' in an open downland location.

1193. Members were advised that although the rationale for only previously granting a temporary planning permission was solely to review the weathering of the cross, and regard should be had for that decision, the principle of development could still be revisited.



1194. It was proposed and seconded to vote on refusal of the officer's recommendation for the reason of visual intrusion into the landscape of the National Park.
1195. The vote for refusal was not carried.
1196. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
1197. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at Section 10.1 of the report and the June 2018 Update Sheet.

**ITEM 9: SDNP/17/00340/HOUS - ERECTION OF 5 LOOSE BOX STABLES - THE TOTE HOUSE, THE MOTOR ROAD, OLD RACECOURSE, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 1UR**

1198. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.
1199. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of Lewes.
  - Vic lent spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Kingston Ward of Lewes District Council.
1200. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC35/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:
- Whether the application involved building outside the regular curtilage of the house and associated grounds.
  - If proposed buildings were subject to the 1993 Article 4 direction in relation to fencing.
  - Whether the Committee needed to identify and approve the need for further stables.
  - If there were upper limits to the number of stables for individual households with regard to personal use.
  - If the proposed development was under the permitted development rights of the Tote House under the current permission.
  - If the application took into account the other subsequent associated equestrian needs of the site such as erection of further fencing and hardstanding.
  - If the British Horse Society had commented on the amount of land available in relation to the number of proposed stables.
1201. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The development extended into the non-residential curtilage.
  - The Land was subject to the Article 4 direction. A structure needed permission/consent in its own right.
  - The proposal was for the personal use of the application and the proposed conditions tied the stables to the dwelling.
  - The scope of personal equestrian use was considered on an application's merits. The intensification of the land required a balanced view in relation to equestrian welfare.
  - Consideration was for the current application only, not what might be forthcoming from this application.
  - The Stabling Officer from the British Horse Society has expressed concerns regarding fencing and compartmentalising of wider land.
1202. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- That the application was not within the existing curtilage of the dwelling.
  - There was considerable significance attached to this area of downland, the extant Article 4 was not aimed at stabling.
  - Principle of not retaining open downland in the location was unacceptable.
  - The proposal straddled the Article 4 and landscape.
  - The proposal should be refused given the harm to the landscape.
  - The proposal would lead to further fencing and would require extra field space and associated equestrian equipment.



- The domestic curtilage needed to be protected.
  - This would be an intrusion into the open landscape.
  - Concern over the scale of the proposal, the need for 5 loose boxes seemed excessive.
1203. It was proposed and seconded to vote on a refusal for the application, for the reasons of intensification of the built form, which together with associated infrastructure would have detrimental impact on open landscape.
1204. The vote was taken and the proposal to refuse carried.
1205. **RESOLVED:** That permission be refused for the reason of the additional built form and associated pressure for equestrian paraphernalia which would be harmful to the open downland character of this part of the South Downs National Park and the Lewes Battlefield designation; the final form of wording be delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 10: SDNP/17/05255/FUL – RENEWAL OF EXISTING AND INSTALLATION OF NEW FENCING - THE TOTE HOUSE, THE MOTOR ROAD, OLD RACECOURSE, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 1UR**

1206. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.
1207. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of Lewes.
  - Vic lent spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Kingston Ward of Lewes District Council.
  - John Ffitch-Heyes spoke in support of the application representing himself and his family.
  - David Marsh spoke in support of the application representing himself.
1208. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC36/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:
- Clarification of the wording of the application. The implication was that if refused the applicant would not be able to renew existing fencing.
  - Whether the wording of the second reason for refusal related to the widening of the track.
  - Whether the fencing that was to be renewed was initially permitted and whether the proposed fencing had been permitted by the Authority on adjacent ground.
  - If the bridleway on the map was currently being used.
1209. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- Both the legally recorded bridleway and the proposed bridleway were currently being used.
  - The application had been submitted as a whole, therefore the matter of replacement and new fencing could not be split.
  - Some of the fencing in the adjoining areas was outside the Article 4 direction. Permission had previously been granted for the wider gallop to be split down the centre line. Officers had been content with the type of fencing at that time. Fencing beyond the riding school was post and rail with a solid plank rail at the top.
1210. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- The formalisation of the widened track was a concern.
  - Concern with regard to the objection to the proposed fencing materials and what was appropriate for equestrian use.
  - The application lacked clarity, a clear distinction between renewal and installation of new fencing could not be made.
  - There was considerable impact on the visual landscape from many surrounding areas.
  - The Officer recommendation should refer to the widening aspects for the track in reason for refusal 2.
1211. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that a number of fences that had been



installed before the permissive development rights have been removed were still in place. There was a landscape objection to all of the application, both the replacement and installation of new fencing with guidance regarding appropriate materials.

1212. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the Officer's recommendation with amended wording for refusal reason 2 to include reference to the widening of the track.
1213. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Section 10.1 of the report and the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet with the inclusion of wording in reason 2 for refusal relating to the widening of the track. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

**ITEM 11: SDNP/17/02082/FUL – RETENTION OF TEMPORARY ERECTION OF ELECTRIC FENCING - THE OAKS, THE MOTOR ROAD, OLD RACECOURSE, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 1UR**

1214. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.
1215. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Vic lent spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Kingston Ward of Lewes District Council.
  - James Oliver spoke in support of the application representing himself.
  - David Marsh spoke in support of the application representing himself.
1216. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC37/18), the public speakers' comments and requested clarification on the following:
- What the Article 4 direction covered with regard to temporary fencing.
  - If the temporary fencing was on the line of fencing which was there previously and permitted or if it was a new sub-division in the area.
  - If the current temporary fencing was installed without permission.
1217. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The Article 4 direction covered the land and anyone who wanted to improve fencing and enclosures, this meant that consent for the fencing was required.
  - The fencing termed in the report as existing was new within the last 2/3 years and did not have any permission.
1218. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- The proposed fencing, whilst a Sussex tradition, was not racecourse or downland appropriate.
  - The fencing applications needed to be considered as one for better clarify and understanding of how the landscape was portrayed in this location.
1219. It was proposed to vote on the Officers recommendation.

1220. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in Section 10 of the report and the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.

**ITEM 12: SDNP/16/06136/FUL – CONSTRUCTION OF MANÉGE - THE OAKS, THE MOTOR ROAD, OLD RACECOURSE, LEWES, EAST SUSSEX BN7 1UR**

1221. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.
1222. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Robert Cheesman spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of Lewes.
  - Vic lent spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor for Kingston Ward of Lewes District Council.
  - James Oliver spoke in support of the application representing himself.
1223. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC38/18) and the public speakers' comments. There being no requests for clarification the Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- That the proposal would be visible from a range of other places given its prominent location.



- The development was located away from the current building.
  - Concern over the visibility of materials used for the proposals.
  - Concern with regard to the shaping of the proposed bunds and changes in levels across the site, which would require substantial levelling.
  - Concern over the potential 'urban creep' across the landscape.
  - Concern with regard to the monitoring of the archaeological excavation of the site.
  - The management of works on site needed careful monitoring.
  - The proposal was unacceptable in landscape grounds.
  - Whilst there would be an impact on the landscape, it would be minor. The site was already being used for equestrian purposes.
  - Whether a construction management plan condition could be inserted to safeguard the surrounding areas.
  - The impact on the National Park in this location was high given the large amount of construction and engineering involved.
  - The recognition of a need for a manège in order to train horses.
  - The riding school was in the wrong location, more suitable locations could be investigated.
1224. It was proposed and seconded to vote for refusal of the application for reason of its form, distance and sensitive location away from the stabling it was associated with which would be harmful to the open downland character of this part of the South Downs National Park and the Lewes Battlefield designation. The final form of the wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.
1225. The vote for refusal was carried.
1226. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reason of its form, distance and sensitive location away from the stabling it was associated with which would be harmful to the open downland character of this part of the South Downs National Park and the Lewes Battlefield designation. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

**ITEM 13: SDNP/18/00440/CND & SDNP/18/00441/CND – HALF ACRE, HAWLKEY RAOD, LISS, HAMPSHIRE, GU33 6JS**

1227. The Case Officer presented the application.
1228. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- David Cauhill spoke against the application as the Chair of Hawkley Parish Council.
  - Angus Murdoch spoke in support of the application as the agent.
1229. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC39/18) and the public speakers' comments and requested clarification with regard to the ownership of the site.
1230. In response the Director of Planning clarified that the ownership of the site was only relevant if a personal application. The Officer recommendation followed the allocation of the site within the Local Plan. The allocation was for a more general restriction for use of the site by Gypsies/Travellers only.
1231. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- Since the previous approval for temporary permission, the Local Plan had been approved by the committee and NPA was now submitted. The Committee should stand firm with previous decision made regarding site allocations, it was for the Local Plan Inspector to consider the appropriateness of site allocations.
  - The applicant was not resident on the site. The previous decision was in regard to the residents of the site and their personal circumstances.
  - Acknowledgement that the Parish Council commented on the Local Plan during the period of public consultation, which represented a wider community.



- Whilst weight should be given to the Local Plan, the application was premature given that the Local Plan had not yet been adopted.
  - There was a conflation of the personal circumstances and the application.
  - Suggestion that current trees be surveyed and new trees put under Tree Preservation Orders this would reduce the landscape implications of the proposals.
1232. The Director of Planning advised the Committee that this was not a unique situation where an application would be forthcoming before the full adoption of the Local Plan. Prematurity of application was not an appropriate reason for refusal, the Authority had committed to the decision that this was a suitable allocation.
1233. It was proposed to vote on the Officer's recommendation.
1234. **RESOLVED:**
1. That planning permission be granted for application reference SDNP/18/00440/CND subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.1 of this report, and;
  2. That planning permission be granted for application reference SDNP/18/00441/CND subject to the conditions set out in Paragraph 10.2 of this report.
1235. The Committee broke for lunch at 13:15.
1236. The Committee reconvened at 14:00.
1237. The Chair of the Committee repeated the common declaration of interest for all members, detailed in minute 1171.

**ITEM 14: SDNP/17/06441/FUL - ARUNDEL LIDO, QUEEN STREET, ARUNDEL, BN18 9JG**

1238. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.
1239. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- David Wood spoke in support of the application as the applicant and Chair of Arundel and Downland Leisure Trust.
  - Roger Edworthy spoke in support of the application representing himself.
  - Nikki Richardson spoke in support of the application representing herself as the Manager of the Lido.
1240. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC40/18) and the public speakers' comments and requested clarification as follows:
- Whether there had been any consideration made for the provision of electric car charging points.
  - If the suggestion to replace the solid boundary fence had been followed up.
  - If the sloppy mortar approach to the brickwork had been removed from the design.
1241. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The car park was currently unaffected by the application and there were no electrical charging points.
  - The boundary fence was to be closed timber around the site. There were limited views between the panels. The boundary needed to be defensible.
  - A sloppy mortar finish was not proposed for the scheme.
1242. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- That the applicants were to be congratulated for their clear, concise report and presentation and the quality of consultation that had been undertaken.
  - This was a good proposal for Arundel, the community and local economy.
  - The development would be an asset to Arundel. Careful quality control in the building management and choice of material was crucial.
  - The design was respectful of the sensitive location and responded to its surroundings.
  - The car park would benefit from being improved in the future.
  - The landscape contribution of grass and installation of bunds did not add to the



attractiveness of the site and had scope for improvement.

- The Landscape Officers comments were in relation to the car park which was not in the application.
- Alternative solutions for the boundary could be considered to improve views across the river.
- Concern over the opening hours and the potential disruption for local residents and whether this timing could be adjusted further.
- An informative could be added in relation to the car park landscaping and provision of electrical car charging points.

1243. It was proposed to vote on the recommendation with the addition of an informative on condition 6.

1244. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, the 14 June 2018 update sheet and the inclusion of an informative on condition 6 relating to landscaping of the car park and provision of electric car charging points. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

#### **ITEM 15: SDNP/18/01217/FUL - ARUN COTTAGE, THE STREET, BURY, RH20 1PA**

1245. Neville Harrison advised the meeting that he had a personal declaration of interest. Richard Dollamore, one of the speakers and agent for the application, had previously worked for the Souths Downs National Park Authority and was known to him.

1246. Barbara Holyome, Doug Jones, Alun Alesbury and Ian Phillips also declared a personal interest in the item in relation to being acquainted with Richard Dollamore.

1247. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet.

1248. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Richard Dollamore spoke in support of the application as the agent for the application.
- Graham Morrison spoke in support of the application as the applicant.

1249. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC41/18) and the public speakers' comments and requested clarification as follows.

- Identification as to which of the proposed buildings and extensions in the present application were physically inconsistent with the buildings permitted by the Appeals Inspector in May 2018.

1250. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- That both schemes could not be built as the proposed developments encroached on each other in several places.

1251. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:

- The application scheme was an attractive combination of buildings.
- Concern on the wording of condition 5 with regard to ensuring that if this current planning application was built out, the other permission for the replacement building, granted under appeal would not be.
- The proposal set out an inspiring layout for the project which responded well to the context of the landscape.
- The development was in a hidden location.
- The proposal was in context to the history of the building and the landscape.

1252. It was proposed to vote on the recommendation with the addition of a further condition after condition 5 to ensure that if the current planning application be built out, the other permission for the replacement building (granted under appeal), would not be. Exact wording (and reason) to be agreed via delegation between the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet and with the addition of a further condition to ensure that if the current planning application be built out, the other



permission for the replacement building (granted under appeal), would not be. The final form of wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

**ITEM 16: SDNP/17/05372/FUL - WILTSHIRE'S BARN, FOLLY LANE, SUTTON, WEST SUSSEX**

1253. The Case Officer presented the application and referred to the June 2018 Update Sheet.
1254. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- Phil Brown spoke in support of the application as the agent for the application.
  - Helen Martin spoke in support of the application as the Headteacher of Duncton CE Junior School and Graffham CE Infant School.
1255. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC42/18) and the public speakers' comments and requested clarification as follows.
- Whether there would be a need for those using the artists retreat to stay overnight.
  - Exactly what the terms of use were in relation to the artists retreat.
  - Whether there was a condition that restricted the numbers that could stay in the retreat overnight.
  - The type of 'artists' that would be accommodated for the retreats.
  - Whether the Barlavington Estate would be managing the booking and therefore restrict the use.
  - The proposed surface of the parking and how many cars would be accommodated.
1256. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The building was self-limiting with regard to the numbers that could stay overnight.
  - Condition 11 had been amended in the Update sheet to 'use' rather than 'occupation' and the wording 'and bunkhouse courses' should be removed from Condition 3.
  - The retreats were to be used for artists in the traditional sense of the word, not artists such as musicians.
  - The use of the building would be restricted as it would be managed directly by the Barlavington Estate
  - The car park would mainly be used by mini-buses, and appropriate surface materials would be secured through condition.
1257. The Committee moved into the debate and commented:
- The application brought an undesignated heritage asset into use.
  - The close proximity to an SSSI and SAC added value to the proposed education use.
  - Whether a site management plan covering supervision, bookings, curtilage, areas of exploration would be appropriate for this application and others in the future.
  - There was scope for greater control over access arrangements. This was an opportunity to set up good rules and procedures for future similar applications and facilities.
  - This was a good scheme in a remote location.
  - Concern regarding the management of the artists retreat scheme.
  - A condition to cover amplified music would be appropriate.
  - There should be minimal alteration to the Chalky Lane access track, there was no need to have double width access for two vehicles.
  - Access arrangements should not be urbanised.
  - This was a core area of the Dark Night Skies (DNS) zone, the comments from the DNS officer had ensured the impact of glazing was reduced considerably.
  - Whether the applicant had considered creating a Whole Estate Plan.
1258. The Director of Planning advised that condition 3 covered management and was realistic given the size of the proposal. Conditions 3 and 4 together acted as a small management plan and other legislation applied beyond planning. A restrictive condition in relation to



amplified music could be added. The SDNPA would take advice from Highways Authority regarding the access, but the control remained with the Authority via conditions.

1259. It was proposed to vote on the recommendation with the addition of a further condition in relation to amplified music.

1260. **RESOLVED:** That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out at paragraph 10.1 as amended at the meeting, the 14 June 2018 Update Sheet and the addition of a condition restricting the use of amplified music. The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

1261. Margaret Paren joined the meeting at 15:57.

#### **ITEM 17: ITEM WITHDRAWN**

#### **ITEM 18: ADOPTION OF THE WEST SUSSEX AND SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY JOINT MINERALS PLAN**

1262. The Planning Policy Lead Officer presented the report and referred to the 14 June 2018 update sheet.

1263. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC43/18) and requested clarification and commented as follows:

- Congratulated the Officers and colleagues at West Sussex on the plan.
- Whether there was any soft sand within the National Park.

1264. In response officers clarified:

- That there was soft sand within in the National Park. The Inspector was satisfied with the site selection study but had raised the issue of the soft sand sites within the Park not being thoroughly considered to ensure adequate supply of material. As one of the first steps in this reviewing this Members would visit potential soft sand sites in August 2018.

1265. **RESOLVED:** The Committee:

- 1) Recommended to the NPA that the Joint Minerals Plan, incorporating the Modifications and updated Policies Map be published and adopted;
- 2) Recommended the Adoption Statement and Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) Report be published;
- 3) Noted the content of the Inspector's Report and his conclusion that the JMLP is legally compliant and sound;
- 4) Noted the ongoing commitment the South Downs National Park Authority has to work in partnership with West Sussex County Council to undertake a Single Issue Review of Soft Sand policy as part of joint working on waste and mineral policy issues;
- 5) Authorised the Director of Planning to agree any further minor non-material changes to the content of the JMLP in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee and WSCC.

#### **ITEM 19: SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS – UPDATE**

1266. There was no presentation of the report. The Chair of the Planning Committee directed Members to the content of the report and asked it to be noted.

1267. The following comments were made by Members:

- It was good to see appeals upheld on the strength of Dark Night Skies.
- What was the resolution to the case where a listed building had been demolished not renovated?

1268. The Director of Planning advised Members that Chichester District Council were investigating the issue with the listed building which had been demolished. Following demolition the site had been redeveloped with the subsequent building being used as a private dwelling, the original application had been for conversion to a holiday let. It was positive to see the costs coming back to the National Park in relation to the Madehurst Lodge appeal.

1269. **RESOLVED:** The committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.



**ITEM 20: TO NOTE THE DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

1270. Thursday 12 July 2018 at 10am at the South Downs Centre, Midhurst.

**CHAIR**

The meeting closed at 16:10.